

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CRAIGSLIST, INC.,
Plaintiff,
v.
DEALERCMO, INC.,
Defendant.

Case No. 16-cv-01451-VC

**ORDER DENYING MOTION TO
COMPEL SUPPLEMENTAL
DISCOVERY RESPONSES**

Re: Dkt. No. 31

The additional information and clarification that craigslist seeks is clearly discoverable, so it's not clear why DealerCMO won't just make things easier for everyone by supplementing its responses to provide the information. However, the interrogatories are poorly drafted, and there's plenty of time for craigslist to ask follow-up questions (hopefully more clearly) through another set of interrogatories. Accordingly, the motion to compel is denied. DealerCMO is on notice that if it does not respond reasonably and thoroughly to the next set of interrogatories, it will be required to pay costs and fees to craigslist pursuant to Rule 37(a)(5)(A).

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: September 14, 2016



VINCE CHHABRIA
United States District Judge